

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/623,903	07/21/2003	Bobby Hu	CFP-2125 (15722-561)	7672
7590 06/21/2004 .		·	EXAMINER	
Alan D. Kamrath			MEISLIN, DEBRA S	
	MERSEREAU, P.A., ATIONAL CENTRE	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
900 SECOND	AVENUE SOUTH	3723		
Minneapolis, MN 55402			DATE MAILED: 06/21/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Assistant Communication	10/623,903	HU, BOBBY					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Debra S Meislin	3723					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply  A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM							
<ul> <li>THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.</li> <li>Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.</li> <li>If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.</li> <li>If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.</li> <li>Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</li> </ul>							
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
,	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under E	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 2</u> is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 2</u> is/are rejected.	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 2</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:							
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage							
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)							
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)     Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)     Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	te atent Application (PTO-152)					
	··						

Application/Control Number: 10/623,903

Art Unit: 3723

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35

U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this

## Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 2. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a or e) as anticipated by Peters ('899) or Huang ('825) or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Peters ('899) or Huang ('825) in view of Hockenbery ('195).

Excerpts from MPEP 2113 follows:

## PRODUCT-BY-PROCESS CLAIMS ARE NOT LIMITED TO THE MANIPULATIONS OF THE RECITED STEPS, ONLY THE STRUCTURE IMPLIED BY THE STEPS

"[E]ven though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process." In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (citations omitted) (Claim was directed to a novolac color developer. The process of making the developer was allowed. The difference between the inventive process and the prior art was the addition of metal oxide and carboxylic acid as separate ingredients instead of adding the more expensive pre-reacted metal carboxylate. The product-by-process claim was rejected because the end product, in both the prior art and the allowed process, ends up containing metal carboxylate. The fact that the metal carboxylate is not directly added,

but is instead produced in-situ does not change the end product.).

ONCE A PRODUCT APPEARING TO BE SUBSTANTIALLY IDENTICAL IS FOUND AND A 35 U.S.C. 102 /103 REJECTION MADE, THE BURDEN SHIFTS TO THE APPLICANT TO SHOW AN UNOBVIOUS DIFFERENCE

Application/Control Number: 10/623,903

Art Unit: 3723

## THE USE OF 35 U.S.C. 102 /103 REJECTIONS FOR PRODUCT-BY-PROCESS CLAIMS HAS BEEN APPROVED BY THE COURTS

Peters or Huang disclose all of the claimed structure set forth by applicant.

Note that the patentability of the product does not depend upon its method of production. Additionally, the limitation "fused together" does not clearly impart any structure to the claimed device other than the elements being connected.

Alternatively, the use of fusing is notoriously old and well known in the art. Hockenbery discloses a wrench head fused to a hollow handle. Consequently, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to connect the handle to the head of Peters or Huang by fusing/welding as such would have been an obvious variant as taught by Hockenbery.

3. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Yang ('515) or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Yang ('515) in view of Hockenbery ('195).

Yang discloses all of the claimed structure set forth by applicant. Note that the patentability of the product does not depend upon its method of production. Additionally, the limitation "fused together" does not clearly impart any structure to the claimed device other than the elements being connected.

Alternatively, the use of fusing is notoriously old and well known in the art. Hockenbery discloses a wrench head fused to a hollow handle. Consequently, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to connect the handle to the head of Yang by fusing/welding as such would have been an obvious variant as taught by Hockenbery.

Application/Control Number: 10/623,903

Art Unit: 3723

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Debra S Meislin whose telephone number is 703 308-3671. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, alt. Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Hail can be reached on 703 308-2687. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Debra S Meislin Primary Examiner Art Unit 3723

June 17, 2004